

REMARKS

Applicants have amended claims 60 and 61 and added new dependent claims 62 and 63 as set forth above. No new matter has been added by way of this amendment. Applicants note with appreciation the Office's indication claims 1-28, 31-38, and 40-59 are allowable over the prior art of record. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding office action is respectfully requested.

The Office has rejected claims 60-61 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,883,988 to Yamamoto et al. (Yamamoto) and also under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 4,937,808 to Shimada et al. (Shimada). The Office asserts Yamamoto discloses a system (FIG. 11) comprising: an elongated optical element 3; at least one structure 3B2 at least partially in a non-opaque portion of the optical element; and a source of light 13₂ positioned to propagate at least a portion of the light through the optical element in a direction generally parallel to a surface of the elongated optical element which faces an object (the object being for example the portion of absorption region 5 which is under electrode 8₂), the structure enhancing the electric field of the light propagating through the optical element which interacts with the object. The Office also asserts Shimada discloses a system (FIG. 1A) comprising: an elongated optical element 3; at least one structure 8 at least partially in a non-opaque portion of the optical element; and a source of light 4 positioned to propagate at least a portion of the light through the optical element in a direction generally parallel to a surface of the elongated optical element which faces an object 7, the structure enhancing the electric field of the light propagating through the optical element which interacts with the object.

Neither Yamamoto nor Shimada, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest, “at least one opaque structure at least partially in a non-opaque portion of the optical element . . . the opaque structure enhancing and directing the electric field of the light propagating through the optical element into a space outside the optical element to interact with the object” as recited in claim 60 or “providing an elongated optical element with at least one opaque structure at least partially in a non-opaque portion of the optical element and at least adjacent to a surface of the optical element . . . the opaque structure enhancing and directing the electric field of the light into a space outside the optical element to interact with the object” as recited in claim 61. With respect to Yamamoto, the Office’s attention is respectfully directed to FIG. 11 in Yamamoto which clearly illustrates that reflection surfaces 3B₁ and 3B₂ reflect the optical beams internally. There simply is not teaching or suggestions of an opaque structure enhancing and directing the electric field of light propagating through an optical element into a space outside the optical element to interact with an object. With respect to Shimada, the Office’ attention is respectfully directed to FIG. 1A and col. 4, lines 17-19 in Shimada, which states, “Light reflected back from the recording medium 16 is led into the optical waveguide 3 through the objective lens 8.” Accordingly, the lens 8 cited by the Office clearly is not an opaque structure. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 60 and 61.

In view of all of the foregoing, Applicants submit that this case is in condition for allowance and such allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 20, 2008

/Gunnar G. Leinberg/
Gunnar G. Leinberg
Registration No. 35,584

NIXON PEABODY LLP
1100 Clinton Square
Rochester, New York 14604
Telephone: (585) 263-1014
Facsimile: (585) 263-1600